

RECEIVED

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

NOV 20 1996

**From:** Charles & Julia <cdc@netdoor.com>  
**To:** A4.A4(fccinfo)  
**Date:** 11/20/96 11:38am  
**Subject:** Internet user fee

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

Sirs,

I would like to take this form to express my request that you deny any attempt by the telephone companies to charge an additional user fee. We are already paying for the phone lines, connections, intra state connections, etc. and it would be an outrage to give the telephone companies the right to charge additional user fees for our right to use the internet lines. ISPs pay them for the connections they have and we as internet citizens pay our ISPs. I personally only am online for approximately 10-30 minutes per day and to be charged an additional user fee for that right based on 24 hours would be unjust. Places with 24 hour connects already pay more to their ISP which in turn has to pay more to the phone companies. It seems to me to be more a "Sour Grapes" attitude by the phone companies. They did not get the internet started or hold complete control over it. I can remember the days when we only had BBSs to go to as a matter of fact I assisted in one. We could not get the phone companies to replace faulty or inadequate equipment. Even today there is trouble at times with the transmissions.

To reward them with a user fee would be double charging us for our own phone lines.

Sincerely,

Charles Reyer

— Life is like a bed of Roses, complete with the fragrance and the thorns.

It depends on how you handle it whether you enjoy it or get hurt! Visit <http://www.freedomstarr.com/?RE7781185> and <http://www.gldb.com/htm/KIA50443.htm>

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE

RECEIVED

NOV 20 1996

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

**From:** Paul <paulo@cybertours.com>  
**To:** A16.A16(rm8775)  
**Date:** 11/19/96 12:32am  
**Subject:** Telephone Company (Internet usage fee)???

Dear Sirs:

I've been informed that alot of local telephone companys are trying to charge people for time they spend on the net.

I feel this is unfair. It's all just greed.

I hope you will not support this. Just my oppinion.

Thanks for your time.

Paul Ouellette >> paulo@cybertours.com

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

RECEIVED

NOV 20 1996

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

**From:** Isaac Lieberman <70253.3572@CompuServe.COM>  
**To:** fcc <rm8775@fcc.gov>  
**Date:** 11/20/96 12:34am  
**Subject:** net taxes

NO NET TAXES, PLEASE!

Thank You!

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

RECEIVED

NOV 20 1996

**From:** TARA AMEE <SAAZ77B@prodigy.com>  
**To:** A16.A16(rm8775)  
**Date:** 11/19/96 7:33pm  
**Subject:** timed internet usage

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

-- [ From: SAAZ77B \* EMC.Ver #2.5.1 ] --

To Whom it May Concern..

I have heard that the phone companies are trying to get permission to charge internet users a timed fee for telephone usage.

If I am dialing a local phone number to a friend there would be no fee; therefore, dialing a local number for internet access should follow the same guidelines. This would simply be getting a foot into the door to charge timed usage fees on local calls. I am already paying a fixed amount for local phone services, if a timed internet usage fee is charged along with this it would be double charging me for the same thing.

I am asking to please take this into consideration in making your decision. I do not believe the general population would like the thought of timed usage on local calls so this should not apply here either.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of this.

Tara Amee sxlf69a@prodigy.com or mooniestars@prodigy.net

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

RECEIVED

NOV 20 1996

**From:** Jill Trued <c669153@showme.missouri.edu>  
**To:** A16.A16(rm8775)  
**Date:** 11/20/96 5:14pm  
**Subject:** Consider me against it...

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

On behalf of those that have to work to make money, I request that you deny the recent request of local phone companies to add a per minute charge for internet use. What benefit would I (and those like me) ever see from this? What does this charge cover? What would I be paying for? As far as I can see, nothing. Zilch.

If what a citizen of the United States says matters any more, please consider me against this.

Thank you,

Jill Trued

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

RECEIVED

NOV 20 1996

**From:** Sharon Jenkins  
**To:** FCCMAIL.SMTP("brad@bleier.com")  
**Date:** 11/20/96 12:51pm  
**Subject:** Chairman's Column Comments -Reply

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Your comment has been forwarded for association with the ACTA Internet Phone Petition (RM No. 8775) Please direct all future comments to [rm8775@fcc.gov](mailto:rm8775@fcc.gov) The ACTA Petition may be viewed on our web site at [http://www.fcc.gov/Bureaus/Common\\_Carrier/Other/actapet.html](http://www.fcc.gov/Bureaus/Common_Carrier/Other/actapet.html)

>>> <brad@bleier.com> 11/14/96 04:00pm >>>  
Bradford A. Bleier (brad@bleier.com) writes:

Dear Sir,

I write to you as both a communications lawyer and an owner of a very small ISP in Sacramento, California. Your speech printed here, as well as your speech printed in this month's issue of "Boardwatch Magazine," is generally very encouraging. However I find some of things you are saying seem to conflict.

First you mention your concern over universal access, and an effort to make internet communications available and affordable. At the same time you mention in your longer speech in Boardwatch the present push by the telephone companies to tax small ISPs. Apparently the FCC is looking favorably on these "not so baby" Bell's requests. I would here present a couple of counter arguments to those of the well heeled Telcoms.

If the taxes that small ISPs are being threatened with come into existence, access will not be affordable, will not be easily available, and will certainly run counter to universal access. The proposed tariffs will allow Bells, like Pacific Bell here in California, to drive all others out of the ISP business, and protect their telephony business from potential competition.

The real reason the Bells are attempting to achieve a different tariff for ISPs is that they, almost universally, are in the ISP business themselves. As an ISP I can tell you that our telephone lines, T1s and frame routing services all suffered severe deterioration in service quality within a month of Pacific Bell's entry into the ISP market. Our analog lines have been "pair gained" prohibiting acceptable bandwidth over the lines, and causing us to lose a substantial portion of our business. Our packet routing, routed over Pacific Bell to their subsidiary Pacific Bell Internet, suddenly routed all packets via Los Angeles on the way across town. These routing problems continue, and are only fixed after substantial effort on the part of my staff.

Pacific Bell has exhibited anti-competitive behavior (enough to more than justify an anti-trust investigation) in an obvious effort to garner the entire market for themselves. It would be a shame, in the shadow of the Telcom bill, to allow the maneuvering of all the baby bells to destroy the free communications market at so early a stage.

The argument that we, as small ISPs take up too much of their analog switches is, at best, ingenuous. Because of the curious tariff structures, and their own choice of hardware, and concomitant choice of switching, ISPs do present a substantial demand on Telcom switches.

However, almost no ISP uses their lines to dial out. The "switching" capacity which we allegedly waste is surplusage. We need the "not so baby" bells to price line access to us in the same way lines are provided to small telephony companies.

In fact, this is the real concern of the Bells. That ISPs will provide fertile ground for telephony competition over the next 12 to 24 months as computer telephony equipment drops in price and increases in capacity.

If the FCC really wishes to implement the Tel Com bill, as passed by Congress, greater emphasis should be given to local telephony competition, and less to protecting the over fed telephone monopolies.

One last concern. I can't speak for other states, but the California PUC follows Pacific Bell on a very short lead. When Pac Bell wanted to charge ISPs differently from other businesses, even those with substantial analog line requirements, the PUC almost immediately created an exception, allowing Pac Bell to charge ISPs for installation charges. These numbers range from \$20,000 to well over \$100,000 charged to very small ISPs who order as few lines as 25 at a time. I have spoken with ISPs who were put out of business by these charges.

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

You should have no sympathy for the Bells. They are inefficient. They over charge. And they engage in anticompetitive conduct that, in the fullness of time, may instigate any number of lawsuits.

Moreover, I would encourage an antitrust investigation of Pacific Bell's conduct of business in California.

Very respectfully,

Bradford A. Bleier  
CEO, Windjammer Communications, LLC [www.windjammer.net](http://www.windjammer.net)  
(916) 454-2114

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0  
Remote host: ATTYB\_B.BLEIER.COM  
Remote IP address: 207.104.47.10

CC: rm8775

RECEIVED

NOV 20 1996

**From:** FCCINFO  
**To:** FCCMAIL.SMTP("twingles@juno.com")  
**Date:** 11/20/96 9:03am  
**Subject:** internet fee -Reply

Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20541

Your comment has been forwarded for association with the ACTA Internet Phone Petition (RM No. 8775) please direct future comments to [rm8775@fcc.gov](mailto:rm8775@fcc.gov)

>>> Gloria M Kraemer <[twingles@juno.com](mailto:twingles@juno.com)> 11/20/96 07:54am >>>

Please don't allow the telephone companies to charge us extra for using the internet. It's bad enough we have to pay cable to get TV.

We are not all business people on the net. If you do your research, you will find the net has a good number of moms who use the net to enrich their knowledge and parenting skills and to make contact with other adults with similar interests.

For those of us who cannot get to the adult section of the library without children along, the net is an invaluable source of information on many topics.

if you want to charge someone for using the net, charge to vendors. maybe this will eliminate the few and I'm sure more-to-come who are running scams here.

Gloria Kraemer, MOT+

**CC:** [rm8775](mailto:rm8775)

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_



RM 8775

RECEIVED

NOV 20 1996

**From:** FCCINFO  
**To:** FCCMAIL.SMTP("infigon@diamond.jcn1.com")  
**Date:** 11/20/96 10:06am  
**Subject:** telephone companies request to change rates -Reply

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

Your comment has been forwarded for association with the ACTA Internet Phone Petition (RM No.8775) Please direct future comments to rm8775@fcc.gov

>>> Becky Wheeler <infigon@jcn1.com> 11/20/96 09:26am >>>  
To Whom It May Concern,

I am very disturbed by the telephone companies request to be able to charge per local phone call as opposed to the current flat rates for local calling. As a single working parent I get a lot of valuable and time-saving information off the internet as well as making many new friends.

If the telephone companies were able to charge differently for local calls I would not have access to this information. If telephone companies wish to profit from the current explosion of technology perhaps they should think of becoming internet service providers themselves. They already have the technology.

I also feel that when they take advantage of technology such as replacing operators with machines and thus cut costs we did not see a comparable rate reduction.

I am opposed to allowing telephone companies to be able to charge per minute rates for local calls.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,  
Becky Wheeler infigon@diamond.jcn1.com

CC: rm8775

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

RM 8775

RECEIVED

NOV 20 1996

From: FCCINFO  
To: FCCMAIL.SMTP("video-1@exis.net")  
Date: 11/20/96 8:07am

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

Your comment has been forwarded for association with the ACTA Internet Phone Petition (RM 8775) Please direct future comments to rm8775@fcc.gov

>>> Danny J. Hale <video-1@exis.net> 11/19/96 03:40pm >>>

What's the deal about Bell Atlantic charging by the min. when we are using the Internet????

Don't we pay enough????

Phone company is getting to big again!!!!

You will close down a lot of local net providers in faver of the big guys!!!!

Do you all really care or is this a wasted e-mail!!!!

Dan

CC: rm8775

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

RM 8775

RECEIVED

NOV 20 1996

**From:** FCCINFO  
**To:** FCCMAIL.SMTP("wildlock@misse.ijkk.fi")  
**Date:** 11/20/96 8:14am  
**Subject:** phone companies charging for internet... -Reply

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

Your comment has been forwarded for association with the ACTA Internet Phone Petition (RM No. 8775) please direct future comments to rm8775@fcc.gov

>>> <wildlock@misse.ijkk.fi> 11/19/96 07:49pm >>>

well.. sure, let them.. if the users make any long distance calls... if i use my phone line for a LOCAL call.. and i'm already paying for LOCAL service, i think the phone company is already getting paid for the use of their lines. i would sincerely hope that they will NOT be allowed to 'listen in' on my PRIVATE telephone conversations, to determine what is a voice call and what is an internet use of the telephone line. heck.. if all they listen for is a data transmission, they'll end up charging me for using the internet, when all i'm doing is accessing a LOCAL BBS with my modem, and even THAT much feels, to me, like an invasion of my privacy. I say this: I pay for LOCAL telephone service, and I use my phone line for LOCAL calls. If I make any long-distance calls, let them charge me for THOSE. The only way I can see any telephone company charging for using their clients for using the lines for internet access is by allowing the companies to listen in on what SHOULD be PRIVATE conversations, to pick out which are NOT 'normal' use of telephone lines.

I implore you to NOT give the telephone companies the ability to listen to my private phone calls. Do NOT let them charge me EXTRA for making a local call on their lines. Thank you.

If you are wondering why someone from Finland(note the email address) has written about this, put your wonderings to rest. I am from Texas. I merely have a Finnish email account, because a good friend of mine from Finland gave me an account on the system he is SysOp on.

**CC:** rm8775

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

RM 8775

RECEIVED

**From:** FCCINFO  
**To:** FCCMAIL.SMTP("rhaas@i1.net")  
**Date:** 11/20/96 8:15am  
**Subject:** Just a concern. -Reply

NOV 20 1996

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

Your comment has been forwarded for association with the ACTA Internet Phone Petition (RM No. 8775) please direct future comments to  
rm8775@fcc.gov

>>> Rick Haas <rhaas@i1.net> 11/19/96 08:02pm >>>

I have heard that there has been a proposal to charge web-browsers a long distance fee for use of the internet. Although it is true that we use the phone lines, the entire purpose of the internet is to allow the average citizen access to an endless supply of information. A long distance fee would limit if not end my use of the internet all together. I, like most other college students, won't have the money for such bills.

I would appreciate your support in standing up to the phone companies which are proposing such charges. I thank you for your time,  
Sarah Haas

**CC:** rm8775

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

RM 8775

RECEIVED

**From:** FCCINFO  
**To:** FCCMAIL.SMTP("mrfitz@diamond.jcn1.com")  
**Date:** 11/20/96 8:16am  
**Subject:** internet -Reply

NOV 20 1996

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

Your comment has been forwarded for association with the ACTA Internet Phone Petition (RM No. 8775) please direct future comments to rm8775@fcc.gov

>>> William fitzpatrick <mrfitz@jcn1.com> 11/19/96 08:15pm >>>

i can see no reason to stop internet phones i am a retired telephone man with 43 years of service WE have to have a telephone line to get onto the net. and the calls we make on the net are poor quality, if i am willing to put up with the quality i dont believe i should be punished,

The reason this country is so great is from inventive people, I believe interference is a backward step, If it is about revenue maybe an

Internet tax for using the net?. Bill Fitzpatrick SBC Corp retired 66

Deborah Roah Hillsboro Mo. 63050 Thank You for reading this. mrfitz@bigfoot.com ps next the phone companies will want a cut for Us using email which is almost as good an invention as the telephone.Thanks again

**CC:** rm8775

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

RECEIVED

NOV 20 1996

**From:** FCCINFO  
**To:** FCCMAIL.SMTP("koenig@jcn1.com")  
**Date:** 11/20/96 8:21am  
**Subject:** fee for internet use -Reply

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

Your comment has been forwarded for association with the ACTA Internet Phone Petition (RM No. 8775) please direct future comments rm8775@fcc.gov

>>> Matt Koenig <koenig@jcn1.com> 11/19/96 08:51pm >>>

Dear Sirs:

The use of the internet is based upon the usage of existing phone lines to connect to a larger area of community lines. I have recently learned that you intend to place a charge upon this FREE service. Those people on the internet are already paying a server to connect to another server that ultimately connects to the world wide web. This fee is charged because it DOES cost to use a long-distance connection, and so that fee is passed onto the user. To charge the user for a service that is already being paid for is seedy, to say the least. Perhaps a tax that could be passed onto the server would be more appropriate.

Please reconsider your plan to charge the internet users a fee. I for one would no longer use the internet because it would cost me more.

Sincerely,  
Matthew Koenig

**CC:** rm8775

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

RECEIVED

NOV 20 1996

**From:** FCCINFO  
**To:** FCCMAIL.SMTP("mikedz@exis.net")  
**Date:** 11/20/96 8:38am  
**Subject:** Telco and ISP's -Reply

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

Your comment has been forwarded for association with the ACTA Internet Phone Petition (RM No. 8775) Please direct future comments to rm8775@fcc.gov

>>> Mike Dziubinski <mikedz@exis.net> 11/19/96 09:44pm >>>  
Dear FCC,

I am concerned about the recent media flurry generated by local telco's regarding their inability to support local internet service providers' connections. I believe their protestation of inability to provide a continued level of emergency services to be alarmist, not supported by technical fact, and reprehensibly profit driven. I strongly urge the FCC to investigate these alarmist claims, establish the technical facts and publish them for use by the consumer.

Regards  
Michael G. Dziubinski

**CC:** rm8775

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

RECEIVED

NOV 20 1996

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

**From:** FCCINFO  
**To:** FCCMAIL.SMTP("exofdr@mnsinc.com")  
**Date:** 11/20/96 8:38am  
**Subject:** Local Phone Charging for Internet Access -Reply

Your comment has been forwarded for association with the ACTA Internet Phone Petition (RM No. 8775) please direct future comments to rm8775@fcc.gov

>>> Marcus Westrick, MS, CLS <exofdr@mnsinc.com> 11/19/96 10:02pm >>>

I wish to express my view that the phone companies should NOT be allowed to charge either Internet Service Providers (ISP) or customers directly to access the internet. Allowing the phone company to charge for connecting when making a local call will stifle the growth of the internet and place unnecessary (and illegal) restrictions on free speech.

I will be writting my Congressional delegation to express my opinion on opposing the phone companies from charging for dialing into an ISP.=20

Thank you.

--=20

+++++

+

Everyday I beat my own previous record for the number of consecutive days  
I=92ve stayed alive

\\//  
(@ @)  
-----oOOo-(\_)oOOo-----

Marcus Westrick, MS, CLS  
The Executive Office of the Doctor

**CC:** rm8775

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_



RECEIVED

NOV 20 1996

**From:** FCCINFO  
**To:** FCCMAIL.SMTP("thomasd@exis.net")  
**Date:** 11/20/96 8:39am  
**Subject:** PER MINUTE CHARGE ON INTERNET ACCESS -Reply

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

Your comment has been forwarded for association with the ACTA Internet Phone Petition (RM No. 8775) please direct future comments to rm8775@fcc.gov

>>> dearing, thomas <thomasd@exis.net> 11/19/96 10:27pm >>>  
TO WHO IT MAY CONCERN,

I UNDERSTAND THAT YOU WILL BE MAKING THE FINAL DECISION ON THE ISSUE ON BELL ATLANTIC'S ATTEMPT TO PUT A "PER MINUTE CHARGE ON INTERNET ACCESS PROVIDERS. IN MY PERSONAL OPINION I FEEL THAT THIS IS WRONG AND IS TOTALLY UNFAIR TO THE CUSTOMERS OF THESE INTERNET PROVIDERS. BY DOING THIS YOU COULD CREATE TOTAL DESTRUCTION.

I HOPE THAT WHEN YOU COME TO MAKE THIS VERY IMPORTANT DECISION YOU WILL TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION THE TAXPAYING PEOPLE AND WHAT WOULD BE BEST FOR THEM.

THANK YOU,

A CONCERNED INTERNET

USER

CC: rm8775

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

RECEIVED

NOV 20 1996

From: FCCINFO  
To: FCCMAIL.SMTP("savage1@skn.net")  
Date: 11/20/96 8:54am

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

Your comment has been forwarded for association with the ACTA Internet Phone Petition (RM No. 8775) please direct future comments to rm8775@fcc.gov

>>> <savage1@skn.net> 11/19/96 11:33pm >>>

>This is important ppl..... check it out. Its YOUR money!

>

>

>>>

>>>i received this message email and thought it was worth passing on. it >>>costs nothing for us to get involved and could save us all loads of >>>money.

>>> On a news broadcast last night from Denver, they said that

>>>the major phone companies are petitioning the FCC to charge Internet >>>users a fee, much like long distance, to use their telephone lines for >>>all their on-line time.

>>> I am sending you the e addy for the FCC. Would you please

>>>send this message to all your e-mail contacts asking them to write a >>>short message to the FCC in an effort to implore them NOT to grant the >>>phone companies this request?

>>> fccinfo@fcc.gov

THIS is just another MONEY MAKING scheme from the telephone companies.....GIVE THE WORKING CLASS A BREAK"FOR ONCE".....i know one thing,if they get their way with this,i,along with a hell of alot of other net users will discontinue our services to the internet.....the people who own the phone companies are ALREADY ..MEGA RICH.....what MORE do they want!!!!!!

THEY(not the F.C.C. people) NEED TO WAKE UP!!!!!!

CC: rm8775

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE

RECEIVED

NOV 20 1996

**From:** FCCINFO  
**To:** FCCMAIL.SMTP("mark1979@jcn1.com")  
**Date:** 11/20/96 8:55am  
**Subject:** user fees -Reply

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

Your comment has been forwarded for association with the ACTA Internet Phone Petition (RM No. 8775) please direct future comments to rm8775@fcc.gov

>>> Mark Huck <mark1979@jcn1.com> 11/19/96 11:40pm >>>

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to voice my displeasure upon hearing that the major phone companies are petitioning to charge internet users a user fee. Please consider haevily the sentiments of the American public for which you represent and serve.

thank you,

Mark Huck

**CC:** rm8775

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

RECEIVED

NOV 20 1996

**From:** FCCINFO  
**To:** FCCMAIL.SMTP("Martin.Ouellet@osg.net")  
**Date:** 11/20/96 8:56am  
**Subject:** internet charges -Reply

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Consumer Affairs

Your comment has been forwarded for association with the ACTA Internet Phone Petition (RM No. 8775) please direct future comments to [rm8775@fcc.gov](mailto:rm8775@fcc.gov)

>>> Martin Ouellet <[Martin.Ouellet@osg.net](mailto:Martin.Ouellet@osg.net)> 11/19/96 11:44pm >>>

what are you doing????? don't you make enough money? some of us are trying to go to school, on minimum wage, while you people are making \$30k+ per year. I use the internet for school, as i am taking a computer course at college, going for my degree. i don't have time to stay at school 24 hours a day to do my internet research, and if you start charging, i will not be able to afford to keep my internet account, which i can hardly pay for as it is. i am going to school on partial scholarships, which i have to renew each semester, if my grades keep way up. Without my internet access, i will lose a large area of study. I can not afford to do that. So, please, please, do not add charges to internet access. There are millions of students in the same position as I am. If you pass this, you are hurting us all. Well, that's all i really have to say. Please consider this. Thank you for hearing me out.

Martin Ouellet

**CC:** rm8775

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

RECEIVED

NOV 20 1996

**From:** FCCINFO  
**To:** FCCMAIL.SMTP("katt@tiac.net")  
**Date:** 11/20/96 8:57am  
**Subject:** charging the Net 8(-Reply)

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

Your comment has been forwarded for association with the ACTA Internet Phone Petition (RM No. 8775) please direct future comments to rm8775@fcc.gov

>>> Pleasure Girl <katt@tiac.net> 11/20/96 12:02am >>>

Dear Sirs and Madams,

I am 20 and live here in the states. I heard about this deal of yours. The charging of the net like long distance. Now the net is a place where young people like me go to get help with papers for school and other such things. I pay a monthly fee and I dial to a local server so I think that what your trying to do is wrong. Its bad enough a lot of the freedom we revolted for has been slowly taken away, but this disturbs me. If oyu do that less people will be on the net, and believe it or not the net brings people from all over the world closer together. So if you do this people like me won't be able to afford an account. Only the rich will and you slowly elliminate a system that is helping us all strive to achieve world peace. It's young people like me who are the future. We are the next generation who was to deal with the worlds down falls. Please, as a consumer I emlore you, don't take our futures away.

Sincerely,

Apryl O'Connell

**CC:** rm8775

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

RECEIVED

NOV 20 1996

From: FCCINFO  
To: FCCMAIL.SMTP("support@mninc.com")  
Date: 11/20/96 8:57am  
Subject: Phone Companies -Reply

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

Your comment has been forwarded for association with the ACTA Internet Phone Petition (RM No. 8775) please direct future comments to [rm8775@fcc.gov](mailto:rm8775@fcc.gov)

>>> Greg Fishback <[support@mninc.com](mailto:support@mninc.com)> 11/20/96 12:55am >>>

If there is any truth to the rumor that you are being solicited by the Phone companies to charge us for Internet usage, I beg of you to not allow this to happen. We pay for out phone lines and we pay for long distance if required. We built the Internet to the level it is, what gives them the right to charge us to use it. If they need to raise the overall phone rates because they are going broke, so be it. I doubt that is happening. I happen to know from the inside that the phone companies are cutting back on personnel and are doing just fine. If we keep them so busy, you'd think that they would be hiring more people to keep up with the work load. As it is, they certainly don't support us. IF IT'S A PROBLEM, HAVE THEM ENCOURAGE THE CABLE COMPANIES TO USE CABLE MODEMS TO TAKE SOME STRAIN OFF THEIR SYSTEM. They don't want this. They are in an ongoing battle to compete with other companies that will take this potential gold mine from them. They refuse to use European technology to increase bandwidth. They want us on line for great lengths of time and want us to pay for it so that they can reap even higher levels of income.

I guarantee you that the average telephone company employee makes a greater take home salary than I do!

Thank you for your time,

Greg Fishback  
MediaNet.inc <http://www.mninc.com>

CC: rm8775

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

RECEIVED

NOV 20 1996

**From:** FCCINFO  
**To:** FCCMAIL.SMTP("robspc@ici.net")  
**Date:** 11/20/96 7:35am  
**Subject:** Phone companies..... -Reply

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

Your comment has been forwarded for association with the ACTA Internet Phone Petition (RM No. 8775) Please direct future comments to rm8775@fcc.gov

>>> Robert P. Mendoza <robspc@ici.net> 09/05/96 06:50am >>>

Dear Sir/madam,

It has been brought to my attention that the major phone companies are requesting permission to charge internet users a fee, much like long distance, to use the internet. This is bogus and I ask you to deny this.

Most people already pay twice for internet service as it is.. They must pay the ISP and the phone company. Which, depending on the online service, is costing some people a paycheck each month as it is. But for a lot of people it is their only source of pleasure as they use the chat groups, e/mail, etc.

Phone Companies get rate hikes at the drop of a hat, anyway. So where is the justification to exhort more from internet users?? I again implore you to deny this request.... Thank you for your time and attention to this letter..

Sincerely, Robert P. Mendoza

**CC:** rm8775

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE